

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-36 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 12-14, 16-19, 21-22, and 33-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gazdik U.S. Patent No. 6,324,691 (hereinafter "Gazdik") in view of Yamaguchi U.S. Patent No. 6,110,229 (hereinafter "Yamaguchi").

Claims 5 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gazdik in view of Yamaguchi and further in view of Dewey et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,652,887 (hereinafter "Dewey").

Claims 23-24, 26-28, 31-32, and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett U.S. Patent No. 5,968,169 (hereinafter "Pickett") in view of Gazdik.

Claims 6, 11, 15, 20, 25, 29, and 30 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 12, 17, 20, 23, and 33-36 to more particularly define the claimed invention and to correct typographical errors.

Applicants have also cancelled claims 15 and 25 without prejudice. No new matter has been added and these amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed specification. The Examiner's rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

Summary of Telephonic Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the June 22, 2005 telephonic interview with the undersigned. During the interview, the Examiner's rejections with respect to independent claims 1, 12, 17, and 23 in light of Gazdik, Yamaguchi, and Pickett were discussed.

Applicants contended that neither Gazdik nor Yamaguchi, whether taken alone or in combination, show or suggest all the features of applicants' independent claims 1, 12, and 17. Applicants also contended that neither Pickett nor Gazdik, whether taken alone or in combination, show or suggest all the features of applicants' independent claim 23. Although applicants maintain these contentions, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this application, applicants are amending the independent claims to more particularly define the claimed invention.

Summary of Applicants' Invention

Applicants' claimed invention describes a processing engine that loads program code, data, and control information using a single input data path. The data includes setup data (for use in setup mode) and program data (for use in run mode). Identification bits are used to identify the data as setup data or program data. An execution pipeline receives and processes the data based on the identification bits. Data identified as program data is processed in the execution pipeline using a current instruction read from memory, while data identified as setup data is propagated through the execution pipeline using a pass-through instruction.

(Applicant's specification, p. 4, line 22 to p. 5, line 31).

Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 12-14, 16-19, 21-22, and 33-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gazdik in view of Yamaguchi. Claims 5 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gazdik in view of Yamaguchi and further in view of Dewey. Claims 23-24, 26-28, 31-32, and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett in view of Gazdik. Claims 6, 11, 15, 20, 25, 29, and 30 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 15, 20, and 25 recite the feature of executing a pass-through instruction to allow setup data to propagate through an execution pipeline without modification. The Examiner has objected to these claims as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form (Office Action, pp. 4-5, ¶¶ 11-12). In particular, the Examiner admits that "[n]one of the prior art of record further teaches the pass through instruction when the data from input path was a setup data, propagated through without modification" (Office Action, p. 5, ¶ 12; see also p. 4, ¶ 11).

Accordingly, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12, 17, 23, and 33-36 to more particularly state that the setup data received by the input data path is processed by executing a pass-through

instruction that causes the setup data to propagate through an execution pipeline without modification.

For at least the foregoing reason, independent claims 1, 12, 17, 23, and 33-36 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-11, 13-14, 16, 18-22, 24, and 26-32, which depend from one of independent claims 1, 12, 17, and 23 are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak

Evelyn C. Mak
Registration No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants

Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000